

## 1. Public Involvement

The WRATS 2040 LRTP provided ample opportunity for public input, dialogue and involvement. As part of the development of the LRTP a series of stakeholder interviews were conducted to get input from organizations with unique and differing perspectives on regional transportation and development issues (Summary in Appendix G). An on-line Transportation Issues Survey was conducted that generated over 500 respondents who provided their input on different aspects of transportation in the region, how they think the existing transportation system is functioning, what improvements to the transportation system they think are important now and for the future, and whether they think transportation improvements require additional resources, and which funding sources and mechanisms should be used to generate additional transportation revenue (Summary in Appendix H). A series of two public involvement meetings were held in differing locations at the beginning of the planning process and after a draft plan was completed to engage the public in the LRTP planning process and invite input, questions, and feedback.

## 2. Public Meetings



### 2.1. Public Meetings – April 7, 2015

On April 7 two public meetings were held to introduce the 2040 LRTP process and timeline, to discuss the 2035 LRTP and the 2012 Transit Feasibility Study, to provide information from the Stakeholder Interviews and the on-line Transportation Issues Survey, to discuss LRTP goals and objectives, to engage in dialogue on transportation issues, and to solicit verbal and written comments. Exhibits below show the meeting announcement, a published version in the *Houston Home Journal*, a comment form, and a summary of the two meetings. The meeting announcement was also posted in English and Spanish at City Hall, at meeting locations, and on the Warner Robins website.

## 2.2. Meeting Announcement

### PUBLIC NOTICE

#### Public Meeting: Year 2040 Warner Robins Area Transportation Plan

The Warner Robins Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) is seeking public comment on the development of goals and objectives for the Year 2040 Transportation Plan for the Warner Robins Area Transportation Study (WRATS). The MPO will hold two public information meetings to help develop the goals and objectives for the plan.

These meetings will be held on April 7, the first at the Georgia Military College Warner Robins Campus (801 Duke Ave, Warner Robins, GA 31093) from 3:30 PM until 5:00 PM and the second at Central Georgia Technical College (80 Cohen Walker Drive Warner Robins, Georgia 31088) from 6:30 PM until 8:00 PM. The purpose of these meetings is to provide the public with an opportunity to comment and offer their input to the goals and objectives used to guide the transportation plan. Information is also available on the WRATS website: <http://www.wrga.gov/index.aspx?NID=295>

The public is invited to attend either of these two meetings. Both meetings will be held in open house format to permit people to drop in and leave as they choose. WRATS and consultant staff will be on hand to discuss transportation issues with participants individually. We look forward to seeing you.

## 2.3. Houston Home Journal Advertisement

2079 WATSON BLVD/ROOM #302  
WARNER ROBINS, GA. 31088  
Pursuant to OCGA §16-13-49(n), all parties claiming an interest in the following described property are hereby notified that said property has been lawfully seized and is subject to forfeiture by virtue of the facts and violations set out below. Case # 2015-02949 Date of seizure: 03/06/15 Place of seizure:

2079 WATSON BLVD/ROOM #302  
WARNER ROBINS, GA. 31088 Violation of law alleged: Manufacturing Schedule I/II (Crack Cocaine) Possession of Schedule I/II with Intent to Distribute Description of Seized Property:

1. \$704 in cash

Conduct giving rise to seizure and forfeiture: On 03/06/15 at 1414 hours, a search of Threats' hotel room at 2079 Watson Blvd/Room #32 resulted in the seizure of approximately twenty grams of crack cocaine and paraphernalia used to manufacture crack cocaine. Mr. Threats was charged with Manufacturing Sched. I/II (crack cocaine) and Possession of Schedule I/II (crack cocaine) with Intent to Distribute. The above listed property was being used or intended for use, directly or indirectly, to facilitate violations of the Georgia controlled Substances Act, and is subject to forfeiture pursuant to O.C.G.A. § 16-13-49. All parties claiming an interest in said property are further advised that they may file a claim within thirty (30) days of the second publication of this Notice of Seizure by sending a claim to the seizing law enforcement agency and to the District Attorney by Certified Mail, return receipt requested, to the addresses set out below. Georgia law provides that such Claims must be under oath, are submitted subject to prosecution for perjury, and that they must comply with OCGA § 16-13-49(n)(4). This 10th day of March, 2015. Name: Brad Mules, Sergeant Agency: Warner Robins Police Department Address: 100 Watson Blvd Warner Robins, Georgia 31093

Assistant District Attorney (s)  
Houston Judicial Circuit  
201 Perry Parkway  
Perry, Georgia 31069  
(478) 218-4810  
129721 3/18-4/8

**NOTICE OF SEIZURE:**  
Pursuant to OCGA §16-13-49(n) all parties claiming an interest in the following property are hereby notified that said property belonging to Corey Lionel Hallett (606 Lawson Drive, Perry, Georgia 31069) and Crystal Gibson (606 Lawson Drive, Perry, Georgia 31069) are hereby notified that the said property has been lawfully seized for Possession of Schedule I/II with intent to distribute, Possession of Marijuana with intent to distribute and Possession of Schedule IV with intent to distribute.

**DATE OF SEIZURE:**  
March 5, 2015

**PLACE OF SEIZURE:**  
753 Commerce Street, Perry, Georgia 31069  
606 Lawson Drive, Perry, Georgia 31069  
**VIOLATION OF LAW ALLEGED:**  
Possession of Schedule I/II with intent to distribute, Possession of Marijuana with intent to distribute and Possession of Schedule IV with intent to distribute

**DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY SEIZED:**  
Sixty-Four plastic baggies of marijuana  
Nineteen Morphine 30mg extended release pills in a CVS prescription bottle  
Fifteen Acetaminophen and tramadol hydrochloride 325mg in a CVS prescription bottle  
One Dell OptiPlex 755 2.33 GHz processor, 80 GB hard drive DVD/CDRW, SN#D5KN3G1

One Keyboard  
One Sherwood Model# RX-4109 SN#RX4109BB (a) IL (A) 1301240Q1454 Receiver  
One Empty blue pill bottle  
One Empty CVS prescription bottle  
One Blister pack containing three Eliacta pills  
One Motorola cell phone black in color  
Six Hundred and Seventy-Four dollars in U.S. Currency (\$674.00)

One Apple PowerBook G4 with charger  
One Dell Computer Purple I color  
One Emerson Tablet Black in color  
One Samsung TV  
SN#26MS3CD0710148R with remote (606 Lawson Drive)  
Four Glass mason jars  
One black and gold in color tote  
One Apple Mac mini SN# YM92606X1BU

Houston Judicial Circuit

201 Perry Parkway  
Perry, Georgia 31069  
(478) 218-4810  
129637 3/25-4/8

### 1100 INCORPORATIONS

#### APPLICATION TO REGISTER A BUSINESS TO BE CONDUCTED UNDER A TRADE NAME

The undersigned hereby certifies that it is conducting a business in the City of Warner Robins, County Houston, State of Georgia under the name of The Taco Shed and the nature of the business is Food and Beverage (service)/Bar and restaurant and that said business is composed of the following Taco Concept LLC: 100 A South Hwy. 247, Warner Robins, Georgia 31088.

**NOTICE OF INCORPORATION**  
Notice is given that articles Incorporations of J.E Johnson Inc. have been delivered to the Secretary of State for filing in accordance with the Georgia Business Corporation Code. The initial registered office of the corporation is located at 158 Solomon Rd Kathleen GA, 31047 and its agent at such address is Carol Elvin  
129731 3/18-3/25

### 1110 MISCELLANEOUS

**NOTICE OF SALE**  
NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT THE UNDERSIGNED INTENDS TO SELL THE PERSONAL PROPERTY DESCRIBED BELOW TO ENFORCE A LIEN ON SAID PROPERTY PURSUANT TO THE GEORGIA CODE SECTIONS 10-4-210 TO 10-4-215. The undersigned will sell at public or private sale by competitive bidding on April 25, 2015 at 2:00 p.m. at the facility known as Centerville Self Storage located at 801 North Houston Lake Rd and/or 953 Carl Vinson Pkwy, Centerville, GA Houston County (478)853-0202, property found in the following units:

Grainger, Bernadette 27  
Various household goods  
McGlon, Tonya 199  
Various household goods  
Parrish, Richard 133  
Various household goods  
Richardson, Tracy 87  
Various household goods  
Smith, Sandra 91  
Various household goods  
Tenants have the right to redeem prior to sale.

129838 3/25-4/1

**NOTICE OF HEARING**  
TO: QUINTREVIUS PIETER You have been identified as the biological father of Baby Boy Kishen born on February 7, 2015 in Houston County, Georgia. The natural and legal mother of this child has surrendered her parental rights and custody to this child to Covenant Care Services, Inc. for adoption. If you have any interest in this child, please contact Covenant Care Services, Inc., 3950 Ridge Avenue, Macon, Georgia 31210, (478) 475-4990 or toll free 1-800-226-5685. If you do not file a response to this Petition with the Court within thirty (30) days of your receipt of this notice, and provide a copy to me as attorney for Covenant Care Services, Inc., you will lose all rights you may have in and to the child and you will neither receive notice nor be entitled to object to the adoption of the child, pursuant to Official Code of Georgia Annotated.

**NOTICE OF HEARING YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED** that counsel of record for Covenant Care Services, Inc., will bring its Petition to Terminate on for hearing before the Superior Court of Bibb County, Bibb County Courthouse, 601 Mulberry Street, Macon, Georgia, at 12:00 NOON ON MONDAY, MAY 4, 2015. THIS IS THE ONLY NOTICE YOU WILL RECEIVE OF SAID HEARING. H.J. STRICKLAND, JR., Georgia Bar No. 004450 Attorney for Covenant Care Services, Inc. 435 Second Street, P.O. Box 6437 Macon, Georgia 31208-6437 (478) 745-2821  
129688 3/18-4/1

### 1120 NAME CHANGES

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT  
OF HOUSTON COUNTY  
STATE OF GEORGIA  
Civil Action File No. 2015-V-112197-K  
**NOTICE OF PETITION TO CHANGE**

appear in said Court and to the objections to such name change. Objections must be filed with said Court within 30 days of the filing of said petition.  
This 3rd day of March 2015.  
Robert Lee Campbell  
129851 3/25-4/15

### 1150 PUBLIC HEARINGS

**INVITATION TO BID**  
Bid Number 15-22  
**JOINT 2015 LOCAL MAINTENANCE AND IMPROVEMENT GRANT BYRON, CENTERVILLE, HAWKINSVILLE, PERRY, WARNER ROBINS HOUSTON & PULASKI COUNTY, GEORGIA**

Sealed Bids will be received at the Houston County Purchasing Department, located at 2020 Kings Chapel Rd, Perry, Ga. until 10:00 AM Thursday, April 9, 2015 for the following project: Resurfacing and repairs of various city streets and county roads in Byron, Centerville, Hawkinsville, Perry, Warner Robins, Houston and Pulaski Counties totaling 23.79 miles. Bid and Contract Documents are available at the Houston County Public Works office. Please provide a 24-hour notice before pick-up to allow for reproduction services. The Public Works office address is 2018 Kings Chapel Road, Perry, Georgia 31069. The Joint 2015 LMIG Committee reserves the right to accept or reject any or all bids and to waive technicalities. All potential bidders must be prequalified. For more information, please contact Brian Jones or Johnny Brooks at 478-987-4280.  
129822 3/25-4/1

**NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING**  
The Board of Commissioners of Houston County will hold a public hearing at its meeting April 21, 2015 at 6:00 p.m. in the Commissioners Board Room, Houston County Annex, 200 Carl Vinson Parkway, Warner Robins, Georgia, in order to discuss bringing the Code of Ordinances of Houston County in compliance with a change in state law by deleting in its entirety Section 58-4-Conservation Use Assessment.  
129827 3/25-4/8

**PUBLIC NOTICE**  
Public Meeting: Year 2040 Warner Robins Area Transportation Plan The Warner Robins Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) is seeking public comment on the development of goals and objectives for the Year 2040 Transportation Plan for the Warner Robins Area Transportation Study (WRATS). The MPO will hold two public information meetings to help develop the goals and objectives for the plan. These meetings will be held on April 7, the first at the Georgia Military College Warner Robins Campus (601 Duke Ave, Warner Robins, GA 31093) from 3:30 PM until 5:00 PM and the second at Central Georgia Technical College (80 Cohen Walker Drive Warner Robins, Georgia 31088) from 6:30 PM until 8:00 PM. The purpose of these meetings is to provide the public with an opportunity to comment and offer their input to the goals and objectives used to guide the transportation plan. Information is also available on the WRATS website: <http://www.wrga.gov/index.aspx?NID=295> The public is invited to attend either of these two meetings. Both meetings will be held in open house format to permit people to drop in and leave as they choose. WRATS and consultant staff will be on hand to discuss transportation issues with participants individually. We look forward to seeing you.  
129836 3/25

### 1160 PROBATE NOTICES

**NOTICE**  
**PROBATE COURT OF HOUSTON COUNTY**

Re: PETITION OF Ken White TO PROBATE IN SOLEMN FORM THE WILL OF Doris S. White, DECEASED, UPON WHICH AN ORDER FOR SERVICE WAS GRANTED BY THIS COURT ON February 23, 2015 TO: Ken White, Neil White, Tim White and to whom it may concern: This is to notify you to file objection, if there is any, to the above referenced petition, in this Court on or before March 30, 2015. BE NOTIFIED FURTHER: All objections to the petition must be in writing, setting forth the grounds of any such objections. If any objections are filed, a hearing will be scheduled at a later date.

## 2.4. Public Comment Form



## Warner Robins Area Transportation Study

2040 Long Range Transportation Plan  
Public Meeting - April 7, 2015



**We want your comments! Public comments are vital to producing a transportation plan that addresses the needs of our citizens!**

**Steve Noble, Atkins**

1600 RiverEdge Parkway, Suite 600

Atlanta, GA 30328

Email: [steve.noble@atkinsglobal.com](mailto:steve.noble@atkinsglobal.com)

**Jessica Bird, City of Warner Robins**

610 B Watson Blvd.,

202 N. Davis Dr. PMB 718

Warner Robins, GA 31093

Email: [jbird@wrga.gov](mailto:jbird@wrga.gov)

(comments are also welcome via email)

### Comments

This image shows a full page of primary-ruled paper. It features ten sets of horizontal lines across the page. Each set consists of three lines: a solid top line, a dashed middle line, and a solid bottom line. The lines are evenly spaced and extend from the left margin to the right edge of the page. There are no margins or other markings present.

## 2.5. April 7 Meeting Summary

### WRATS 2040 LRTP

#### Public Meetings – April 7, 2015

##### Meeting Summary

On Tuesday, April 7, 2015, WRATS held two public meetings on the 2040 LRTP. The meetings were held from 3:30 PM until 5:00 PM at the Georgia Military College Warner Robins Campus, and from 6:30 PM until 8:00 PM at the Central Georgia Technical College Warner Robins Campus. The purpose of the meetings were to provide the public with background information on WRATS, the 2040 LRTP, current transportation goals and objectives (from the 2035 LRTP), and existing projects and studies, and to solicit feedback on what transportation issues should be considered important in this iteration of the LRTP. The meetings were held in open house format to permit attendees to arrive and leave at their option while still having a chance to engage in discussion on the LRTP. Eleven people attended the first public meeting at Georgia Military College, and nine people attended the second public meeting at Central Georgia Technical College (one participant did not sign in).

Attendees were provided an LRTP fact sheet, with information about WRATS and the 2040 LRTP including the overall project schedule and staff and consultant contact information, and comment forms for providing written comments. A 5 minute looping PowerPoint presentation provided some background information. In addition, there were large scale plots of the current LRTP goals and objectives, regional demographics and projections, some preliminary response to an on-line transportation issues survey and stakeholder interviews, and various modal elements of the Warner Robins Region transportation network including a proposed transit system, current and future proposed pedestrian and bicycle projects, road capacity projects, and a 2010 road network level-of-service analysis. Participants were invited to view the PowerPoint and plots and to ask questions or provide their comment on what aspects of the transportation system were important to them or that they felt need improvement. They were also notified of the transportation issues survey URL and that the survey would still be available on-line for a couple of weeks.

At the first public meeting the discussion focused almost exclusively on transit. Participants generally felt that a transit system is needed in the Warner Robins Region and wanted to know how soon such a service could start and what the impediments to starting a system were. Staff noted that a Transit Feasibility Study had been conducted in 2012 that recommended a starter system of fixed route and demand responsive transit but that questions remained as to how such a system would be paid for and organized. Many of the attendees at this meeting were associated with the Warner Robins Housing Authority. It was also noted by staff and several attendees that a new initiative examining the potential for a social service oriented demand responsive transit system in Warner Robins is recently underway.

At the second public meeting the discussion was broader but much of it also focused on the need for a regional transit system. A number of participants noted the need for more integrated land use and comprehensive planning that moves the region away from sprawl, and that transportation plans should be subordinate to overall development plans. Staff acknowledged this but noted that the 2040 LRTP needs to be adopted by October 27, 2015 and that we are using the latest Georgia DCA required comprehensive plans for Houston and Peach Counties in part as a basis for demographic projections. There was general discussion about the need to support Robins AFB mission as the area's largest employer, and that a transit system and additional pedestrian and bicycle facilities would help in that regard. Again, much of the discussion focused on how to initiate a transit system and who needs to take action in that regard.

### 3. Draft LRTP Public Notice

Consistent with the adopted WRATS Public Participation Plan and requirements of the US Department of Transportation Statewide and Metropolitan Transportation Planning Rules, the 2040 WRATS LRTP is subject to a 30 day public review and comment period prior to official action on the draft plan. Notice of availability of the draft plan for review and comment is published in the *Houston Home Journal*, the county's official legal publication. A sample of the Notice of Availability advertisement from the *Houston Home Journal* appears below.

#### Houston Home Journal Advertisement - PUBLIC NOTICE

**PUBLIC NOTICE**

Public Review Period: Draft 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan for the Warner Robins Area Transportation Study (WRATS). The Warner Robins Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) is seeking public comment on the Draft 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) for the Warner Robins Urban Area. Federal and State planning regulations require that the MPO prepare a Long Range Transportation Plan that addresses at least a 20-year planning horizon. The current LRTP, which was produced in 2010, defines the needed street and highway programs for the year 2035. The Long Range Transportation Plan is presently being updated to address the transportation needs for the year 2040. The Georgia DOT uses the LRTP as a guide for planning and programming the construction of transportation facilities in the WRATS area. The Warner Robins MPO will hold a public review period of thirty days to solicit comments from the public on the Draft 2040 LRTP. Copies of the document will be available at the following locations from September 11 through October 12, 2015: Warner Robins City Hall Annex, Transportation Planner's Office; Houston County Annex, Commissioners Office; Centerville City Hall, City Clerk's Office; Byron City Hall, Public Works Department; Perry City Hall, Community Development Department; Centerville Public Library; Warner Robins Public Library and [www.wrga.gov](http://www.wrga.gov). Public comments on the Draft 2040 LRTP are encouraged and welcome.

**132492 9/9**

In addition to publishing notice of availability of the draft 2040 WRATS LRTP, notices are posted in the Warner Robins, Centerville, Perry and Byron City Halls and in the Administrative Offices of Houston County, Georgia. Notices are also posted at the Warner Robins and Centerville Public Libraries. The draft 2040 WRATS LRTP was also made available on the WRATS webpages through the City of Warner Robins website and referenced on the City's Facebook page.



### 3.1. Draft LRTP Meeting – October 1

Two public meetings were held on the draft 2040 WRATS LRTP to provide information to the public and to allow the public to ask questions and make comments on the draft plan. The Public Notice for the meetings is shown below and was available in English and Spanish versions.

#### **PUBLIC NOTICE**

##### **Public Meeting: Year 2040 Warner Robins Area Transportation Study**

The Warner Robins Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) is seeking public comment on the Draft 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) for the Warner Robins Region. The MPO will hold two public information meetings to review and take public comment on the LRTP.

These meetings will be held on October 1, the first at the Georgia Military College Warner Robins Campus (801 Duke Ave, Warner Robins, GA 31093) from 3:30 PM until 5:00 PM, and the second at Central Georgia Technical College (80 Cohen Walker Drive Warner Robins, Georgia 31088) from 6:30 PM until 8:00 PM. The purpose of these meetings is to provide the public with an opportunity to comment and offer their input to the draft LRTP before the adoption of the final plan. Information is also available on the WRATS website: <http://www.wrga.gov/index.aspx?NID=297>

The public is invited to attend either of these two meetings. Both meetings will be held in open house format with an opportunity for the public to review presentation materials and engage in discussion with staff who worked on the plan. Staff will be available at each meeting to discuss the plan, the plans recommendations, and to answer questions and address concerns interested individuals may have. The LRTP identifies the transportation needs for roads, bridges, public transportation, bicycles, pedestrians, and freight movement in the year 2040 based on the anticipated growth in the MPO area. We look forward to seeing you.

## 3.2. October 1 Meeting Summary

### WRATS 2040 LRTP

#### Public Meetings – October 1, 2015

##### Meeting Summary

On Thursday, October 1, 2015, WRATS held two public meetings to discuss the WRATS Draft 2040 LRTP. The meetings were held from 3:30 PM until 5:00 PM at the Georgia Military College Warner Robins Campus, and from 6:30 PM until 8:00 PM at the Central Georgia Technical College Warner Robins Campus. The propose of the meetings was to provide the public information on the Draft 2040 LRTP during the required 30 day public comment period, and to solicit comment and feedback on the draft plan from the general public. Five people attended the first meeting at Georgia Military College, and one person attended the second meeting at Central Georgia Technical College.

A 6 minute looping PowerPoint presentation provided summary information on and highlights of the WRATS Draft 2040 LRTP. Attendees were provided an LRTP fact sheet and comment forms and invited to comment on the LRTP or ask questions of staff.

Similar to the first round of public meetings in April, much of the discussion focused on the potential for a transit system in Warner Robins and how to get a transit system started. There were questions about the Transportation Issues Survey and the Stakeholder Interviews and how those related to the LRTP. There were a few questions about information presented on fatal transportation crashes, crash rates, and the location of fatal transportation crashes. There were a few questions about the population and employment projections for the region and whether completion of the current widening and improvement of GA Highway 96 had been considered in sociodemographic projections. One participant noted that the region has improved for bicyclists and pedestrians in recent years.



A comment form is used to solicit and document public comments on the draft 2040 WRATS LRTP. Public comments are also taken by email. A copy of the public comment form distributed at the public meetings is shown below.

## 4. LRTP Press and Media Coverage

WMAZ Channel 13 conducted an interview with Jessica Bird, WRATS, on the 2040 LRTP Transportation Issues Survey on February 4, 2014<sup>1</sup>. The Transportation Issues Survey was also mentioned in the Macon Telegraph and the Robins AFB Rev-Up.

The Macon Telegraph included a listing of the April 7 WRATS Public Meeting on their Community Calendar. The Macon Telegraph published an article about the draft WRATS 2040 LRTP public open-house meetings on September 30, 2015 which was also on their website as seen in the exhibit below.

2C • Wednesday, September 30, 2015 • The Telegraph

# Local News

macon.com Visit our website for around-the-clock breaking news — both in your neighborhood and around the world. PLEASE RECYCLE THIS NEWSPAPER NEWS TIPS 478-744-INFO

## WR seeks public input on 2040 transportation plan

By LAURA CORLEY  
lcorley@macon.com

The Warner Robins Metropolitan Planning Organization will hold two public information meetings Thursday to get feedback on the area's long-range transportation plan for 2040.

The long-range Warner Robins Area Transportation Study, required by the federal government, is used to identify multi-modal transportation needs 20 years into the future. It takes into account anticipated population growth.

Atkins, a global engineering and consultant firm, began working with the city on the long-range plan last November. After several studies, stakeholder input and public feedback, people will have a final opportunity to learn about and comment on the 99-page draft version of the completed plan before it is finalized by Oct. 27.

The first public input meeting will last from 3:30 p.m. until 5 p.m. at the Georgia Military College Warner Robins Campus on Duke Avenue. A second meeting will be held from 6:30 p.m. until 8 p.m. at Central Georgia Technical College on Cohen Walker Drive, according to a news release.

"If (people) have a specific transportation need or they think that something's not being addressed or if they like how something is being done as far as transportation in the area, then I think it would be great for them to come out so we can hear what their comments are," said Jessica Bird, transportation planner for the city of Warner Robins and its Metropolitan Planning Organization.

The study area includes the cities of Warner Robins, Perry, Byron and Centerville as well as Robins Air Force Base and a chunk of eastern Peach County along Interstate 75. In 2010, the total area's population was 149,480, a number that's expected to increase by 2040, according to the plan. Houston County's population alone is expected to climb from about 139,900 people to 221,200 by 2040, according to the report.

"Nobody really knows exactly what's going to happen (in 2040), but any kind of increase (in population) over the years obviously adds more cars to the roads," Bird said. "So, if you don't do anything to the roads that you have ... you're going to start seeing (traffic) congestion in areas that you haven't seen before."

The addition of bicycle and pedestrian paths also are part of the plan as a result of public feedback, Bird said.

"I know a lot of people are frustrated because they live in a subdivision that has sidewalks, but once they leave their subdivision, they can't go anywhere because the sidewalks don't connect," Bird said. "So, I would say connectivity is probably a very big issue."

The public also has long expressed a desire for public transit, something Warner Robins City Council members recently said lacks funding. In 2010, the city's urbanized area was "among the nation's largest by population with no reported transit service," according to the draft plan.

A 2012 public transit study looked at creating bus lines and projected about 1,542 weekday riders.

No initial steps have been taken by the city to offer public transportation. However, the long-term draft plan says a business group is trying to find private and public funds that could be used to start up such a service.

To contact writer Laura Corley, call 744-4334 or follow her on Twitter @Lauracor.

**Events Calendar**  
Fax information for the calendar three days in advance to 478-744-4385 or email pfountain@macon.com.

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.13wmaz.com/media/cinematic/video/22894543/voice-your-opinion-in-transportation-study/>

## 5. Summary of Public Comments Received

There were no comments received on the draft WRATS 2040 LRTP from the general public at either of the two public meetings held on October 1, 2015 or via the WRATS 2040 email address posted on the City of Warner Robins website on the same page as the plan document.

Comments were received from the Georgia Department of Transportation and the Federal Highway Administration on a preliminary draft LRTP. These comments appear in the exhibits below. A number of these comments were addressed prior to the version of the draft WRATS 2040 LRTP that was released for public review and comment, particularly those that corrected typographical or formatting errors within the document.

### 5.1. GDOT Comments on WRATS Draft 2040 LRTP

**\*page numbers are according to main PDF document**

The WRATS 2040 LRTP contains a lot of valuable information and innovations (Performance Measures) that at times needs to be point out to the reader. This is a highly technical document and many efforts should be undertaken to make sure there is a 'flow' between document body and appendices.

Comments were divided in three categories. Content, is an easy fix of 'copy and paste', General comments are aim to better content, and Constrained List, is separated due to its importance.

#### COMMENTS ON CONTENT:

##### Policy Committee Members

Pg. 8: Policy Committee Voting members list needs to be updated with Russell McMurry's name as GDOT commissioner, as is noted in the PC Committee bylaws.

##### Table of Contents/List of Figures/Tables

Pg. 5: List of Figures: Figure 5.1, 5.3, should read "2010" instead of "2006"

Pg. 6: List of Tables: Table 6.2 should be shown to be in page "6-2" and not in "6-1". Table "6-3" is located in "6-3", not in "6-1". Table "6-4" is located in "6-4" and not in "6-1". The table of content is linking all these tables to the same page, maybe revise the link.

#### Section 1 Introduction

Pg. 12, 13: Make sure maps are legible utilizing visual hierarchy. For example, in page 12, Peach county boundary appears more relevant than WRATS Study Area. Map for Figure 5.4, the numbers are not legible

Pg. 15, Media Campaign: Please use present tense in the sentence "Notice of public meetings was advertised in the Houston Home Journal... transportation issues survey availability were mentioned..."

Pg. 16, Information Dissemination: Make sure it is stated planning documents are placed in the web

Pg. 14-18: Update the date on the footer. Instead of "October 26, 2010", use 2015

## **Section 2 Goals and Objectives**

Pg. 19, Goals and Objectives: Instead of TEA-21, use SAFETEA-LU in second and third paragraph to reflect the change from seven (&) to eight (8) planning factors

Pg. 21: under the 2.6 section "USDOT Implementation of MAP-21 Performance Provisions". The paragraph mentions the "Existing Transportation Systems Assessment Data in Appendix Z". Please, update to "Existing Transportation Systems Conditions", as is noted in Appendices list, Appendix E"

## **Section 3 Socioeconomic Data**

Pg. 22, 3 Socioeconomic Data: Please mention why Appendix C has complete list of SE data with 630 TAZs and not only 331 like it is stated in Pg. 10, Section 1.2 WRATS Study Area (to avoid confusion)

Pg. 28, Environmental Justice: In the last paragraph, "Figure 3.1" is written twice.

## **Section 4 Land Use**

Pg. 30, Existing Land Use: please specify with years which 'most recent comprehensive plans' were used. '2006 Comp Plan' seems outdated

Pg. 37, Transportation/Communication/Utilities: The acronym "T/R/C" means "Transportation/Communication/Utilities"? If different, please explain

Pg. 37: Transportation/Communication/Utilities: it should read "Table 4.1", instead of just "Table 4"

Pg. 38, Please add the word 'potential' in section 4.1.3: '(15) high-growth highway corridors'

Pg. 45, Future Land Use: Please use the most recent plans utilized

## **Section 5 Transportation Needs**

Pg. 76, 5.3.1 Existing Conditions, State Bike System Routes: Make a reference of such routes are depicted in Figure 5.8

Pg. 76, Bicycle Crash: Change reference of "Table 5.1" to "Table 5.2"

Pg. 77, Pedestrian Crash: Change reference of "Table 5.2" to "Table 5.3"

Pg. 79, Figure 5.8, MPO should consider insets for the urban area to showcase WRATS Bicycle and Pedestrian infrastructure

Pg. 81, Table 5.4 O&M Spending tab should read '(2010-2014)'

Pg. 81, Needs Analysis: \$10.7 Million in 24 years is \$256 Million, not \$250. Mention why MPO under budget this item

## **Section 6 Transportation Plan Funding**

Pg. 83, 6.1 Estimated Costs: Table 6.2 is slightly different from the one presented at the PC Committee Meeting, where the project Map No. 17 was lower (\$146,790,300 instead of \$147,360,414). Is this the latest and greatest and adds up to \$798,443,288?

## **Section 7 Plan Recommendations**

Pg. 87, 89, 91, 94 and 97. Figures 7.1-7.5: Make sure maps are legible. The Short Range Projects have the same color as WRATS boundary, numbers are too small and 'roads and bridge projects' are too noticeable vs bands



## Appendices

Appendix D: There is a note in all the titles for Figure and Tables in this appendix that reads: "Error! No text of specified style in document", please make the corrections and number them as appropriate

Appendix F, Section 3.0 Environmental Mitigation: Refer to Figures 1, 2, and 3 in the text of this section

### GENERAL COMMENTS:

- MPO should take in account MAP-21 emphasis areas
- If time allows, a glossary of terms and acronyms may be useful for readers; or, at least spell out each acronym first and define it in a footnote. Example, 'NPRMs' in page 21 and 'LOS' in page 40
- Pg. 11, Section 1.3 Planning Process: Please elaborate on the reasoning behind continuing with the same goals and objectives "The 2040 LRTP uses the same Goals and Objectives developed for the 2035 LRTP."
- Pg. 17, Committees: Add language in first paragraph in which the PC Committee is required per federal regulations and its members are elected officials
- Pg. 19. Section 2 Goals and objectives: You may want to add some verbiage about how the last LRTP plan met, did not meet or exceeded the goals from the 2035 cycle, besides the fact that the goals remained the same, for continuity. This point is already discussed in section 2.6: "This LRTP begins to collect and examine data in anticipation of the future performance measures, as documented by the Existing Transportation Systems Assessment Data in Appendix Z. Although this begins to establish baseline performance for some aspects of the regional transportation system additional data will need to be compiled, generated, or collected and analyzed to allow a more complete assessment." Maybe repeat this sentence in a way it addresses the efforts to assess goal accomplishment (in page 19).

- Pg. 19-21, Goals 1 to 5: If the MPO has decided to use the planning factors as goals for the 2040 LRTP, please clarify in the introductory paragraph how the planning factors address the goals that are envisioned by the MPO
- Pg. 21, Goal 5: the definition "*Promote efficient system management and operation and emphasize the preservation of the existing transportation system*" can be undertaken with the Objective: Develop maintenance plan to maintain existing structure (Just a suggestion)
- Pg. 21, Performance Measures: Elaborate more in the fact that the MPO is attempting a Performance Based Plan since last update. This is one of the points the MPO should take credit for. Also, please reference GDOT's Performance Measures goals, objective and Performance Metric(s)<sup>1</sup>
- Pg. 22, Socioeconomic Data: Please note who developed the data and make an introduction of the Model Development Methodology in Appendix A and Socioeconomic Data Development Methodology Appendix D
- Pg. 28, Environmental Justice: Mention if MPO has an Environmental Justice document and when was last updated. Please break down in the map which E.J. populations are present in the Warner Robins area and their percentages and how that information was used to in outreach efforts and the decision making process in the LRTP
- Land Use: In "Corridor Area Perspective", is this expected growth should be in the SE Data and therefore, show up in the LRTP 2040 No-Build model? Maybe this would help explain the use of LOS since the 'corridors' assessment has land use and transportation analysis. And if this was identified in the 2030 LRTP what makes it relevant ten years later (the model?). Please, add a sentence where it is stated that after an evaluation, these corridors are still valid.

Thus, if the same fifteen (15) corridors are used in current land use and future land use, maybe make a connection from the current land use conditions and LOS/Transportation Issues assessments in the 4.2.3 section, instead of current paragraph, that would also void the need to mention the list of corridors

again. It can be understood as a new set of corridors if reader does not compare

- Future Land Use Policies: Please explain efforts to re-evaluate policies dated from 2005.
- Make a connection between the land use recommendations in Section 4 with transportation needs in section 5 and project recommendations in Section 7. In section 5, page 66, maybe mention that land use project recommendations were accounted to elaborate Figure 5.4 and not only modeling. Below, there are few statements in which such projects are missing or vary on Section 7:  
Pg. 58, Corridor 4: The LRTP recommendations section does not have a project for the corridor in mid-range

Pg. 60, Corridor 8: The LRTP recommendations section does not have a project for the corridor in illustrative list, but in long-range

Pg. 62, Corridor 12: LRTP recommends one long-range project on I-75 from Bibb County to Watson Blvd. (instead of "Russell Parkway") and two illustrative projects from Watson Blvd. to Russell Parkway and from Russell to Perry Parkway

Pg. 62, Corridor 14: LRTP recommends a mid-term project on White Road/Thomson Road from SR 49 to SR11/US41 (instead of Houston Lake Blvd.)

- Pg. 82, Estimated Costs: Explain how WRATS used the guidelines to develop projected revenue and cost inflation
- Pg. 84, Available Funding: Explain how WRATS used the guidelines to estimate SPLOST funding
- Also, make a reference in the body of the LRTP to Appendix F, SHPS Linkage and Environmental Mitigation.

### **Comments on Projects Constrained List**

- Project Map No 2, PI 322460- the CST has not being programmed for FY 2016 yet. Please, use "2016-2020"
- Make sure all the projects in Table 6.2 match exactly what GDOT has in the system. Example: "SR 247 @ BIG INDIAN CREEK & OVERFLOW 9 MI SE OF PERRY" (GDOT format) vs. **"SR247 Bridge Replacement at Big Indian Creek"** (Page 86). If MPO needs assistance, let GDOT know
- To conclude, just a kindly reminder, Planning recommended in the PC Committee Meeting to revise the priority list to make sure it reflects stakeholders' input, not only in the Short Range Band but to extend prioritization for the whole constrained list. GDOT understand the LRTP priority list as the accurate representation of all the participants within the MPO area and programming will follow such list

## 5.2. Response to GDOT Comments

Most GDOT comments dealt with typographical or formatting errors in the preliminary review draft and these changes were made to the Draft 2040 WRATS 2040 LRTP prior to its being released for public review and comment on September 11, 2015.

GDOT general comments were mostly dealt with by adding additional narrative and or references within the document. Most of these changes were made prior to public release of the Draft LRTP for public review and comment however some were not made until the final draft version on October 18, 2015 after the public comment period.

A number of changes to the Draft LRTP recommended by GDOT were not made for the reasons outlined below.

### ***Comment:***

- *To conclude, just a kindly reminder, Planning recommended in the PC Committee Meeting to revise the priority list to make sure it reflects stakeholders' input, not only in the Short Range Band but to extend prioritization for the whole constrained list. GDOT understand the LRTP priority list as the accurate representation of all the participants within the MPO area and programming will follow such list*

### ***Response:***

Although GDOT recommended at the PC meeting to revise the (project) priority list, after discussion there was no action taken on this request. It is common practice among most MPOs

not to prioritize the entire list of recommended projects beyond those included in short-range. The plan is redone on 5-year intervals and can be amended as necessary at any time during intervening years.

***Comment:***

Pg. 12, 13: Make sure maps are legible utilizing visual hierarchy. For example, in page 12, Peach county boundary appears more relevant than WRATS Study Area. Map for Figure 5.4, the numbers are not legible

***Response:***

The Peach County boundary is very important within the maps because only a portion of Peach County is within the WRATS Study Area. The MPO boundary is deliberately made semi-transparent to show this relationship. Fonts were increased in size on the maps and some numbers repositioned.

***Comment:***

Pg. 15, Media Campaign: Please use present tense in the sentence "Notice of public meetings was advertised in the Houston Home Journal... transportation issues survey availability were mentioned..."

***Response:***

Once the LRTP document is finalized the media campaign information will be past, so the use of past tense for readers makes sense.



### 5.3. FHWA Review of WRATS 2040 Draft LRTP and MPO Response

Due to the extensive nature of comments received on the preliminary Draft LRTP from USDOT, most comments were not addressed prior to the version of the Draft LRTP released for public review and comment on September 11, 2015 but were incorporated in the Final Draft LRTP dated October 18, 2015. The exhibit below contains the response to USDOT's comments.

LRTP FHWA/FTA Comments			
MPO: Warner Robins MPO		Date: August 31, 2015	
SECTIONS	FHWA/FTA Comments	MPO's Comments	Page #
Cover Page			
	Add Title VI disclaimer.	Added	
1. Introduction			
1.3 Planning Process	Revise wording for metropolitan transportation planning process. ".....coordination and improvements for all modes..." Not all these are modes. Revise to include language for transportation strategies, which include ITS, transportation system enhancement, etc.	Left as is. Although not all elements referenced are modes, the paragraph references coordination of improvements for all modes which includes ITS, transportation enhancements etc.	1-4
1.4 Public Involvement Process	Information relevant to the development of this document was placed in Appendix B, G, and H. To demonstrate a well-coordinated public involvement process, provide a summary from Appendix B, G, and H here as well.	Summary paragraphs regarding public involvement materials in the appendices added.	1-5
	Page 1-9, revise first paragraph on this page by removing reference of past Federal transportation authorization. MAP-21 reference is sufficient.	Left as is. Paragraph relates to the history of the requirement for public involvement.	1-9
Figure 1.3	Performance-Based Planning and Programming is now a part of the transportation process. Revise to accurately represent the current transportation process to include Performance-Based Planning and Programming.	Figure 2.1 USDOT Performance Based Planning Process flowchart added.	1-8
2. Goals and Objectives			

Performance Measures	Performance measures are a significant part of this section. Revise section to include Performance Measures in the heading (Goals, Objectives, and Performance Measures).	Changed to Goals, Objectives, Performance Measures and Strategies	2-1
	Under this section, the MPO is attempting a performance-based plan, so take credit for it. Consider revising section by moving up 2.6, discuss performance-based planning, and document where the Warner Robins MPO is regarding performance-based planning. Information relevant to this section is in Appendix E.	Moved section 2.6 up and added additional discussion of material in Appendix E	2-3
	National Goal Areas: Some of the national performance goals overlap with the 8 planning factors. In this section of the LRTP, the MPO did not specifically identify (1) Infrastructure Condition, (2) System Reliability, (3) and Freight Movement as a goal. MAP-21 Implementation is one of the Planning Emphasis Areas that was emphasized in the FY 2017 UPWP. Revise draft LRTP to include the three outlined goal area. See Appendix E.	Revised to acknowledge the National Transportation Goal Areas and related them to the 8 MPO LRTP Planning Factors. Freight Movement and System Reliability are addressed in Goals 1 and 3. Altered Goal 5 and associated performance measures to include Infrastructure Condition. Added Table 2.1: WRATS 2040 LRTP Goals and Relation to MAP-21 MPO LRTP Planning Factors.	
	Remove all reference of expired Federal transportation authorization. MAP-21 reference is sufficient.	Left as is. Provides historical context.	
	Remove last sentence that states “2040 LRTP uses the same goals, objectives, and similar performance measures as the 2035 Plan to maintain continuity.....” Keep in mind that the metropolitan transportation planning process must be cooperative, <b>continuous</b> (reflective of changes to the region), and comprehensive.	Removed	
2.1 Economic Vitality	Revise this section to place greater emphasis on the economic vitality of this region. How does the current transportation system impact the economic vitality of this region? Document and discuss in detail at the community and regional impact.	Language added reflecting the importance of transportation to the economic vitality of the region.	
	Consider including objectives and performance measures from Goal 3 to demonstrate the region’s commitment to economic development	Acknowledged after Goal 5 that there is overlap between the goals and objectives. The commitment of the region to economic development goes beyond transportation.	
2.2 Safety and Security	Revise objectives and measures under this goal area to be	Added objective and performance measure	

	clear about ensuring the security of this region. The focus in this section is only on Safety.	specific to security.	
	<i>Safety.</i> Revise this section to place greater emphasis on safety to satisfy 23 CFR 450.322(h). Some of the required documentation is listed in Appendix E and Appendix F. Move information to this section of the LRTP.	General language added and a note listing what type of information specific to safety is located in Appendix E and Appendix F.	
	<i>Security.</i> Revise this section to place emphasis on security to satisfy 23 CFR 450.322(h). The 2040 LRTP did not identify disaster preparedness/emergency relief plans/strategies/policy, etc.	General language added and objective and performance measure added with respect to Emergency Preparedness Plans.	
2.4 Quality of Life	This can also impact the economic vitality of the region. Revise to place emphasis on Quality of Life. Objectives and measures from other goal areas such as Goals 3 and 5 work.	Language added to Goals 3 and 4 with specific objectives and performance measure added pertaining to access to essential services.	
2.6 MAP-21 Implementation	This section lists an Appendix Z. Revise to say Appendix E	Revised	
<b>3. Socioeconomic Data</b>			
3.6 Environmental Justice	Remove word “planning” from the first paragraph as EJ impacts are not only at the transportation planning level.	Left as is. Broadly speaking the MPO transportation planning process includes everything.	
	Discuss in greater detail EJ communities identified on figure 3.1 and define and identify minorities and LEP population.	Added Table 3.9: Environmental Justice Populations as a share of Warner Robins MSA Population. Added Census 2013 ACS 5-year data statement about LEP population.	
	Discuss in specific detail how the EJ communities in the Warner Robins MPO participated in the outreach efforts associated with developing the 2040 Plan, include identifying goals, objectives, and project selection. As you revise this section, keep in mind, Access to Essential Services, one of the planning Emphasis Areas.	Narrative added explaining how EJ communities participated in developing the 2040 LRTP through the public meetings, Stakeholder Interviews, and Transportation Issues Survey.	
	Include summary from the Transportation Issues Survey and Stakeholder Interviews as they relate to the EJ population participation and needs identified.	Same reply as above	
<b>4. Land Use</b>			
	Land use pattern has a significant impact on the transportation needs of this region, so consider adding transportation to this title (Land Use and Transportation)	Left as is. While this is true, the Land Use chapter is within a transportation plan and addresses the interrelation between	

	and bring into focus.	development patterns and transportation.	
4.1 Existing	Second paragraph on page 4-1, "in development of the 2030 LRTP ..." Did you mean to say 2030? Please revise.	Added statement to clarify language. Yes, the 15 high growth corridors were initially developed as part of the 2030 LRTP, but we are still using them.	
4.2 Future Land Use Plan	The MPO should monitor and track implementation of land use recommendations in the 2040 Plan.	No change. Although the LRTP makes land use recommendations, WRATS has no direct authority or control over local land use plans or regulations.	
	Since the region's comprehensive plans are drawing from the LRTP, it is recommended that the MPO update its Short Term Work Program (STWP) to reflect implementation of a new LRTP. The current STWP is still pulling from the 2030 LRTP.	Note added regarding update of current Comp. Plan. The Regional Commission – not the MPO – prepares Comp. Plans on behalf of its member jurisdictions including Houston and Peach Counties. The MPO is involved in but not responsible for LU plans and associated development regulations.	
4.2.3 Corridor Area Perspective	Since this section provides an overview of future land use and presents recommendations for transportation projects, consider retitle Transportation Issues to Transportation Issues and Recommendations.	Changed to Transportation Issues and Recommendations	
	For this section, it is recommended that this LRTP includes an update of accomplishments in the areas of land use and transportation since the last LRTP update (2035).	Paragraph added under Section 5 Transportation Needs describing transportation-related accomplishments since 2035 LRTP.	
	Recommended Land Use Policies are still pulling from at minimum, the 2035 LRTP. Where is the region on implementing some of these policies as well as conducting further studies where recommended? Document progress/efforts.	No change. There is no direct linkage between the LRTP land use policy recommendations and Comp. Plans or development regulations.	
<b>5. Transportation Needs</b>			
5.1 Roads and Bridges	Regarding Roads and Bridges, document in specific detail needs identified in the Transportation Issues Survey and Stakeholder Interviews. List survey questions and results identifying issues/challenges surrounding the existing conditions of roads and bridges in this region.	Paragraphs added explaining issues identified by a majority of input from Stakeholder Interviews and Transportation Issues Survey. References Appendix G and Appendix H for more detailed information.	

	This section focuses solely on LOS. Revise to provide a better overview of the region's transportation challenges/needs to bring in line with the outlined goals, objectives, performance measures, and the Transportation Issues Survey and Stakeholder Interviews result.	Same reply as above	
5.1.1 Existing Conditions	The primary transportation focus of this section is on LOS. Document in specific detail what is driving diminished LOS on major roadways (truck traffic, SOV, etc.) and how the region and communities stand to benefit from the recommended transportation improvements (link back to the Transportation Issues Survey, Stakeholder Interviews, the region's goals, objectives, measures, and policy recommendations).	Added Figure 5.1: Roadway Level of Service (LOS). General statement added about existing road and bridge system based on crash rates and public involvement input.	
	In specific detail, document how the projects and recommended policies were influenced by the MPO's goals, objectives, and measures. -Economic Vitality -Safety and Security -Accessibility, Mobility, and Connectivity -Environment and Quality of Life -Management and Preservation of Existing System	Added selected general narrative (at this point the LRTP is not fully a PBP, the NPRMS are not final, not much coordination between GDOT and MPOs on performance measures or the data necessary for ongoing review has occurred).	
	Include these goal areas and discuss implementation strategies; - Infrastructure condition - System reliability - Freight movement and economic vitality	Added strategies in Section 2.7	
5.1.2 Needs Analysis	Several long-range and short-range strategies (access management, signal coordination, ITS, etc.) were identified in this section. Revise section to place stronger emphasis on these strategies in implementing the MPO's goals, objectives, measures, and policies. This should tell why the outlined projects were selected for this region.	Added in a narrative form.	
	Keep in mind that MAP-21 placed emphasis on economic vitality, as a goal area and planning factor. Update this section to show consideration of MAP-21 and discuss/identify economic development challenges if any in	We are not aware of specific economic development that is hindered by the current transportation system or its condition other than perhaps lack of transit service. And	



	this region and transportation related project(s) and/or strategies that will address economic vitality in this region.	transit service is proposed by the LRTP.	
	Regarding the Transportation Issues Survey and Stakeholder Interviews, document the needs identified during these surveys.	Added in a narrative form.	
	Keep in mind that MAP-21 placed great emphasis on safety, which is also a planning factor and a goal area for the MPO. Update this section to show consideration of MAP-21 and discuss/identify safety issues/challenges if any in this region and identify transportation related project(s) and/or strategies that will address these issues. See comment under Safety section as well	See reply under safety section. Road safety does not appear to be that much of an issue except in localized circumstances. Additional bike/ped. facilities to some extent address safety.	
5.2 Public Transportation	Document in specific the detail the effects of not having a public transportation system and affected population/communities (use the same level of documentation provided in the Bicycle and Pedestrian section). In doing so, keep in mind the MPO's goals and objectives, the planning factors and national performance goal area, and Access to Essential Services, one of the Planning Emphasis Area.	Brief language added concerning effect on transportation disadvantaged population. Note added which gives location of Transit Feasibility Study on website.	
	Table 5.1 includes Route Name and Description. As part of the documentation, identify EJ communities along the outlined bus routes.	No change. This is done in detail in the Transit Feasibility Study.	
	Highlight results from the Transportation Issues Survey and Stakeholder Interviews for this section.	Results mentioned at the beginning of Section 5.	
5.3 Bicycle and Pedestrian	Documentation in this section is good; however, document result from the Transportation Issues Survey and Stakeholder Interviews regarding bicycle and pedestrian facilities needs in this region.	Statement added in 5.3.2 regarding Stakeholder Interview and Transportation Issues Survey.	
5.5 Freight and Goods Movement	Keep in mind that MAP-21 placed emphasis on freight and goods movement. Update this section to show consideration of MAP-21 and discuss/identify transportation related project(s) and/or strategies that will address freight and goods movement in this region.	Figure 5.11: WRATS Freight Network added with accompanying narrative. Strategies added in Section 2.7	

5.6 Operations and Maintenance	In this section, the LRTP should focus on strategies to improve performance of existing transportation facilities to relieve vehicular congestion and maximize the safety and mobility of people and goods. Revise accordingly.	Identified and described specific strategies from Section 2.7 to improve performance of existing transportation system. Also added related feedback from public meetings, Stakeholder Interviews, and Transportation Issues Survey.	
	Keep in mind that MAP-21 placed emphasis on infrastructure condition and system reliability. Update this section to show consideration of MAP-21 and discuss/identify transportation related project(s) and/or strategies that will address these two goal areas. Updating this section will also show consideration towards management and preservation of existing system, one of the 8 planning factors.	Same reply as above	
5.6.1 Existing Conditions	Both the 2035 Plan and the 2040 LRTP look at O & M spending from 2006 – 2010, but the data differs. Why? For instance, spending for the City of Byron did not appear in the 2035 LRTP, but was added to the 2040 LRTP.	Table 5.4 is mislabeled. The time period for the 2040 LRTP should be from 2009 to 2013. Also we used different data sources. We did not have separate data for Byron when preparing the 2035 LRTP. Label corrected and data source provided.	
	Although both the 2035 and 2040 LRTP are using data from same period (2006 – 2010), spending for some jurisdiction increased/decreased in the 2040 Plan. Explain.	Different data sources. In 2035 we asked local jurisdictions in 2040 we used data from the DCA Local Government Finance Reports. Data source now provided.	
<b>6. Transportation Plan Funding</b>			
6.1 Estimated Costs	Last sentence, first paragraph of this section states that the 2040 LRTP will incorporate an expenditure category for transit, but this is not documented in the transit section. Revise transit section to include this information. The suggested level of documentation is provided in the Bicycle and Pedestrian section.	Included language in the Public Transportation Section to state that this level of funding is included in the 2040 LRTP.	
	Table 6.1 lists O & M estimated cost for the local jurisdiction, but this cost is different from what is listed in Figure 5.4. Revise/explain	Table 5.4 lists average current local government O&M expenditure per year. Table 6.1 lists estimated cumulative local government O&M expenditure over the period of the LRTP. Total local and state	

		O&M were set to keep the percentage spent on O&M at current levels. This is now stated in Section 6.1.	
	Table 6.1 indicates that funding to support freight and goods movement throughout this region is lumped into Roads and Bridges. Revise both the Roads and Bridges and Freight and Goods Movement sections and identify projects/programs/policies, etc. that are in support of this effort for this region. Focus should be given to economic vitality/development.	These are programmatic expenses in the absence of specific projects. Almost all transportation projects can be shown to have an impact on economic vitality and development. This seems more important at the systems level.	
6.2 Available Funding	Similar to the information presented in Table 5.4, include a breakdown of local jurisdiction revenue to include identification of SPLOST funding.	SPLOST funds have been separated from local funds in Table 6.4: Estimated Transportation Funding by Year (\$ millions).	
	Identify and document local sources revenue from MPO's jurisdictions.	Same reply as above	
	Include a breakdown of Federal/State share and local match by phase for each project identified in the 2040 LRTP.	No change. Specific project funding is done through the TIP and local programming processes and is not a requirement of projects in the LRTP other than those that are already in the TIP.	
<b>7. Plan Recommendations</b>			
	The transportation modeling component is not the only process that went into forming recommendations for the Warner Robins 2040 LRTP. Revise this section to accurately document the overall process. This should include documentation of how the MPO's goals, objectives, and measures, the 8 planning factors and MAP-21 goal area, and the MPO's Transportation Issues Survey, and Stakeholder Interviews influenced this Plan.	Added language on recommendation of Goals, Objectives, Performance Measures and Strategies (specifics in Section 2) along with program and project recommendations such as transit, bicycle & pedestrian systems, ITS/TSM/TDM & Intersection projects, maintenance and operations, and road & bridge projects.	
	In revising this section, also include implementation strategies/policies/programs, etc.	Same reply as above	
	Include documentation highlighting projects coming from the 2035 LRTP and newly added, if any.	No change. All projects are coming from the 2035 LRTP other than the change in programmatic expenditures for transit and bike/ped. There are no absolutely new projects.	

	Keep in mind that this Plan should have a multi-modal focus. Where are the bicycle and pedestrian and Transit projects? Identify	There are no specific b/p or transit projects. There are program expenses only. There will likely be b/p elements of some road projects but we do not have specific designs for most projects.	
7.1-7.3	The Plan shall include design concept and design scope descriptions of all existing and proposed transportation facilities in sufficient detail, regardless of funding source. Revise these sections accordingly.	Does not apply. Within 23 CFR Part 450, design concept and scope applies only to projects in air quality maintenance and non-attainment areas and projects in a NEPA process.	
<b>Appendix B. Public Involvement</b>			
1.0 Public Involvement	Where is Appendix X?	This is a typo. Corrected to Appendix G.	
	Where is Appendix Y?	This is a typo. Corrected to Appendix H.	
<b>Appendix E. Existing Regional Transportation Condition</b>			
	First sentence, first paragraph of this section states that a survey of existing transportation conditions data was made to established baseline conditions...where is this survey and resulting data?	Not a specific survey/questionnaire but an examination of available data.	
	In revising the LRTP to incorporate the below comments, focus on ensuring that the MPO's goals, objectives, measures, feedback derived from the Transportation Issues Survey, Stakeholder Interviews, consideration and incorporation of the planning factors and MAP-21 goal areas are clearly documented and communicated in a consistent manner throughout this plan. The information presented in this section already set the tone for this LRTP to be a performance-based plan. Take the necessary credit by focusing less on the updating the MPO's 2035 LRTP and more on developing a performance-based 2040 LRTP.	Attempted to incorporate performance based planning and programming into the document to the extent possible, although final regulations are not available and discussions between FHWA/GDOT and GDOT/MPO regarding performance measures still needs to happen.	
Road and Bridge Conditions	The information presented here on pavement and bridge conditions in the Warner Robins region is good. Revise Roads and Bridges section(s) of the LRTP to include this level of documentation. This is also an opportunity for the MPO to take credit for where the region is on implementing a performance-based LRTP.	Incorporated language into Road and Bridge section on conditions and added reference to Appendix E.	

Roadway Traffic and Operating Conditions	Incorporate observation of operating conditions related to traffic volumes, including freight traffic, LOS, and travel time speed/delays. In this Appendix, performance measures for operations and system reliability are identified and discussed, but are not emphasized in related sections, including Plan Recommendation section of the draft 2040 LRTP. This is an opportunity for the MPO to take credit for where it is regarding performance measures.	Added narrative and included reference to Appendix E.	
Safety	See the above comments under Roadway Traffic and Operating Conditions and make the necessary revisions to the draft 2040 LRTP. Safety was not an area of emphasis in earlier sections of this plan although it is a goal area for the MPO, the planning factors, and MAP-21 goal area. Revise document to place stronger emphasis on safety.	Added narrative and a table and included reference to Appendix E.	
<b>Appendix F.</b>			
1.0 Introduction	Revise by removing expired transportation legislation. Background is not necessary. MAP-21 reference is sufficient.	Left as is. Needed for historical perspective.	
2.0 SHSP Linkage	Revise this section by putting it with Safety to show requirements at the Federal and State level, what is occurring in the Warner Robins region comparing to the State.	Referenced Appendix F with respect to linkages between the LRTP and State Highway Safety Plan using a note in Section 2.3	
3.0 Environmental Mitigation	Keep in mind that Environment Sustainability is a national goal area and is also included as one of the MPO's goals. Revise draft LRTP and include this section in the actual Plan not just in its current location. This revision should also include strategies; some are already identified throughout this Plan.	Left as is. Strategies added in Section 2 of document.	
<b>Appendix G. Stakeholder Interviews</b>			
Stakeholder Interviews	Information provided here is relevant to the level of public involvement and coordination. Revise public involvement section to include summary of this stakeholder engagement and resulting feedback on the region's transportation system and how feedback influenced the 2040 Plan.	Language added to Section 1.4	
<b>Appendix H. Transportation Issues Survey</b>			



	Resulting feedback from this survey is vital in assessing where the region is and where it needs to be. In the related sections, document is specific detail how the results influenced the goals, objectives, measures, implementation strategies, and project selection/plan recommendation process of the LRTP.	Language added to appropriate sections	
Implementation Strategies			
	Include a section with the heading Implementation Strategies for future evaluation of effectiveness. For start, funding has been identified for ITS/TSM/TDM strategies in Table 6.1; In relevant sections, identify implementation strategies to carry out the regions' goals, objectives, and performance measures.	Added Strategies to Section 2 and references in various locations within LRTP.	